UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,951	11/21/2003	Carlton Lane	MSFT-2787/303656.01	2907

23377 7590 08/01/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER	
TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,951	LANE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ISAAC T. TECKLU	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-29 and 31-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-29 and 31-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10, 12-29 and 31-38 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10, 12-29 and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder (US 6,415,246 B1) in view of Sinn (US 6,732,089 B1).

As per claim 1 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses a method for deploying at least one stored procedure to a device (col. 19:59-62 "… device database …"), the method comprising:

generating a data project (e.g. FIG. 2, step 5 and related text) and a device database within a solution (col. 16:5-20 "… build local tables for test conditions and test limits …");

associating the data project with the device database (col. 7:15-30 "… tables for a test can bet … dependent variables … data in these tables can be dependent upon the indicated values …');

adding the at least one stored procedure to the data project, the at least one stored procedure comprising a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database; (col.13:5-20 "… test script assumed a balanced +/- tolerance … original source code would need to be reworked…" and col.15:15-25 "… procedure map module can be a standard code module that contains dispatch routine …" and e.g. FIG. 2, step 8 and related text)

receiving a request to build the solution, and, responsive to the request; (col. 27:45-55 "… response to a user request …");

automatically embedding each stored procedure (col. 16:45-50 "… utilize fully functional SQL …" and e.g. Fig. 2, step 5 and related text) into a device database (col. 6: 40-50 "… data to be stored in normalized relational database …" col. 19:59-62 "… device database …" and e.g. FIG. 2, step 9 and related text);

automatically deploying the device database to the device with the at least one embedded stored procedure as a single unit (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …" and e.g. Fig. 2, step 8 and related text).

Snyder does not explicitly disclose registering each stored procedure with the device database. However, Sinn discloses a method, apparatus and program storage device for enabling SQL statement access to remote system specific data and functions is provided. Snyder discloses a different conventional approach for accessing system specific information is an SQL

stored procedure. With this approach, as detailed in FIG. 3, specific procedure programs 301 are stored on a server 303. The client 305 can then use an SQL statement to invoke the stored procedure on the server side. For example, a procedure program 301 must be created and registered using an SQL statement creates procedure. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Snyder and Sinn to invoke the stored procedure on the server side to obtain system specific data under secured environment using the signature of the stored procedure as once suggested by Sinn (col. 2: 15-30).

As per claim 2 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising compiling code for the at least on stored procedure (col. 2:23-30 "… recompiling the code …").

As per claim 3, Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, comprising embedding a trigger into the device database (e.g. FIG. 2, step 16 and related text).

As per claim 4 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising reserving data storage capacity for the at least on stored procedure within the device database (e.g. FIG. 1, storage 300 and related text).

As per claim 5 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

determining whether the at least on stored procedure has been previously embedded on the database (e.g. FIG. 2, step 4 and related text); and

if the at least on stored procedure has been previously embedded, then removing the previously embedded stored procedure (col. 32:35-39 "… overwriting…" and e.g. FIG. 2, step 5 and related text).

As per claim 6, Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, comprising deploying the device database to the device as part of a main device project (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …").

As per claim 7, Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, comprising deploying the device database to the device as part of a device setup project (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …").

As per claim 8 (Currently Amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 1, comprising registering the stored procedure with the device database at the device after the device database is deployed with the at least one embedded stored procedure to the device (col. 17:40-50 "… registered with test set database …" and e.g. Fig. 2, step 5 and related text).

As per claim 9 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses a method for deploying a stored procedure comprising a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database to a device (col.13:5-20 "… test script assumed a balanced +/- tolerance … original source code would need to be reworked…" and col.15:15-25 "… procedure map module can be

a standard code module that contains dispatch routine …" and e.g. FIG. 2, step 8 and related text), the method comprising:

providing a first interface that enables a data project containing the at least one stored procedure and a trigger (col.20: 25-35 "… SQL commands/queries …"), and a device project containing a device database to be generated within a solution, the first interface further enabling the stored procedure and the trigger (col.29:55-65 "… routine can use Scribe to query the value of the "test status token …") ~~data project~~ to be associated with the device database (col. 16:5-20 "… build local tables for test conditions and test limits …") and; embedding the assembly within the device database (col. 19:59-63, col. 16:5-12, col. 30:32-35);

providing a second interface that enables the at least one stored procedure and the trigger to be added to an assembly within the data project (e.g. FIG. 2, step 8 and related text);

receiving a request to build the solution, and, responsive to the request (col. 27:45-55 "… response to a user request …");

automatically deploying the device database to the device (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …").

Snyder does not explicitly automatically disclose registering each stored procedure with the device database. However, Sinn discloses a method, apparatus and program storage device for enabling SQL statement access to remote system specific data and functions is provided. Snyder discloses a different conventional approach for accessing system specific information is an SQL stored procedure. With this approach, as detailed in FIG. 3, specific procedure programs 301 are stored on a server 303. The client 305 can then use an SQL statement to

invoke the stored procedure on the server side. For example, a procedure program 301 must be created and registered using an SQL statement creates procedure. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Snyder and Sinn to invoke the stored procedure on the server side to obtain system specific data under secured environment using the signature of the stored procedure as once suggested by Sin (col. 2: 15-30).

As per claim 10 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising providing an interface displaying a view of the at least one stored procedure (e.g. FIG. 3, 1200 and related text).

As per claim 12 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the second interface enables the at least one stored procedure to be deleted from the (col. 17:31-39, col. 30:9-11).

As per claim 13 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising providing an interface displaying a view of properties of the at least one stored procedure (e.g. FIG. 3, 1200 and related text)..

As per claim 14, Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising compiling code for the stored procedure (col. 2:23-30 "… recompiling the code …").

As per claim 15, Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, comprising embedding the assembly within the device database, the assembly comprising a trigger (e.g. FIG. 2, step 16 and related text).

As per claim 16, Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising: determining whether the assembly has been previously embedded on the device database (e.g. FIG. 2, step 4 and related text); and

if the assembly has been previously embedded, then removing the previously embedded assembly (col. 32:35-39 "… overwriting…" and e.g. FIG. 2, step 5 and related text).

As per claim 17, Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, comprising deploying the device database to the device as part of a main device project (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …").

As per claim 18, Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, comprising deploying the device database to the device as part of a device setup project (col. 30:4-6, 32-39, 51-56 "… setup, install, project, device …").

As per claim 19 (Currently amended), Snyder discloses the method of claim 9, comprising registering the at least one stored procedure with the device database at the device after the device database has been deployed with the embedded assembly to the device(col. 17:40-50 "… registered with test set database …" and e.g. Fig. 2, step 5 and related text).

As per claim 20, this is the computer readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 1), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 21, this is the computer readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 2), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 22, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 23, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 24, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 5), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 25, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 6), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 26, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 27, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 8), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 28, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 9), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 29, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 10), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 31, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 12), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 32, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 13), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 33, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 14), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 34, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 15), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 35, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 16), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 36, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 17), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 37, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 18), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

As per claim 38, this is the computer readable medium of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 19), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious over Snyder.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 06/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant asserted that "updating a test data object to include a measured value, as disclosed in Snyder, does not suggest adding to a data project a stored procedure that comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database" (page 11 of 14).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above assertion. Contrary to the above assertion, Snyder does disclose precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in

a database. For instance, in col.13:5-20, Snyder discloses "the hard-coded limit checkers retrieved specific token values and calculated acceptable ranges. Multiple schemes were used within the limits files. The specific scheme was hard-coded within the local limit checker. If the test script author assumed a balanced +/-tolerance, and later it was determined that a different value was needed for the positive and negative terms, the source code (precompiled code) would need to be reworked, rebuilt and re-released." (emphasis added). Thus, the above argument is not persuasive.

The Applicant asserted that "A trigger may query or edit table(s) and may include complex SQL statement. While Fig. 2, step 16, and the related text of Snyder is cited as teaching the embedding of an assembly comprising a trigger within the device database ... Snyder merely teaches storing a result indicating whether a measured value falls outside of normal bounds" (page 12 of 14).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above assertion that contrary to the above argument that Snyder merely teaches storing a result indicating whether a measured value falls outside of normal bounds, Snyder in col.20: 25-35 also teaches a trigger within the device database ("...as a disconnect which allows the test executive and script authors to concentrate on their specialties (test instrumentation and flow control) while allowing the database professionals to pursue a fully normalized database solution without having to worry about explaining its subtleties to "non-database" team members. In general, the test executive will utilize this database interface layer for all interaction with the database as opposed to parsing

and executing its own queries and SQL commands." (emphasis added). Thus the above argument is not persuasive. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the previous ground of rejection has been maintained.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAAC T. TECKLU whose telephone number is (571)272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:300A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Isaac T Tecklu/ Examiner, Art Unit 2192	/Tuan Q. Dam/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192